

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING | DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO | |
|----------------------------------|------------|------------|----------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|--|
| 10/711,756 | 10/01/2004 | | Jeff DeFazio | SunReader | 5755 | |
| 23217 | 7590 | 12/22/2005 | | EXAMINER | | |
| GLENN L. WEBB | | | | VARGOT, MATHIEU D | | |
| P.O BOX 951 CONIFER, CO 80433 | | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| | | | | 1732 | | |
| | | | | DATE MAILED: 12/22/2005 | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| to | |
|----|---|
| | 1 |

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|-------------------|---------------|--|
| 10/711,756 | DEFAZIO, JEFF | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | | |
| Mathieu D. Vargot | 1732 | |

| before the Filling of all Appeal biller | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| | Mathieu D. Vargot | 1732 | | | | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the c | orrespondence add | ress | | | | | |
| THE REPLY FILED 07 December 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS | S APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO | OR ALLOWANCE. | | | | | | |
| The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following | | | | | | | | |
| a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date | time periods: a) \boxtimes The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection. | | | | | | | |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. I no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN | | | | | | | | |
| TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7 | 06.07(f). | | | | | | | |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | | | | | | | | |
| NOTICE OF APPEAL | dianas with 27 CED 44 27 must be | filed within two seast | a of the date of | | | | | |
| 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a). | | | | | | | | |
| AMENDMENTS | | | | | | | | |
| 3. \boxtimes The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) \boxtimes They raise new issues that would require further co | nsideration and/or search (see NO | | ecause | | | | | |
| (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below | • | | | | | | | |
| (c) They are not deemed to place the application in beaution appeal; and/or | tter form for appeal by materially re- | ducing or simplifying | the issues for | | | | | |
| (d) They present additional claims without canceling a | corresponding number of finally rej | ected claims. | | | | | | |
| NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1 | • • • | | | | | | | |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1 | | mpliant Amendment | (PTOL-324). | | | | | |
| 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s) | | | | | | | | |
| 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s). | · | • | • | | | | | |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: NONE. Claim(s) objected to: NONE. Claim(s) rejected: 21-33. | | | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>1-20</u> . AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | | | | | | | | |
| B. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | _ | • | | | | | | |
| 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar. | overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appear y and was not earlier presented. So | al and/or appellant fai ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1 | ls to provide a | | | | | |
| 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER | n of the status of the claims after e | ntry is below or attach | ned. | | | | | |
| 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered by See Continuation Sheet. | it does NOT place the application in | n condition for allowar | nce because: | | | | | |
| 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). | (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper N | lo(s) | | | | | | |
| 13. Other: M-Varget | | | | | | | | |
| | | Mathieu D. Vargot | | | | | | |
| | | Primary Examiner | | | | | | |
| | | Art Unit: 1732 /2/19/もら | | | | | | |

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The aspect of the second lens blank being within said first lens blank as set forth in claims 21, 32 and 33 constitutes a new issue at this point.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: As noted supra, it raises issue of new matter. The rejection concerning the aspect of disguising focal powers has been addressed. It is noted that the divisional applications 10/904,173 and 10/904,175 have been allowed. The instant application would also be allowed with all independent claims limited so as to be commensurate in scope therewith-- ie, the limiting of the claims to --1) the making of a lens assembly for sunglasses; 2) the making of the lens assembly with an outer lens of one power and an inner lens within the outer lens of another, different power; 3) dyeing the outer and inner lenses with pigmentation so that light transmission therethrough is limited; and 4) coating the outer and inner lenses so that the differeing focal powers of each are disguised to an observer. Essentially, applicant has already claimed these aspects in the independent lens claims of the copending divisionals and it is believed that these aspects in combination would be what makes the instant application allowable.